

OCT 31 1949

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

Cupled
PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

Our Responsibility in Germany
Ernest O. Melby 68

Human Relations Education For Teachers
Through the Institute Type Course
Max Birnbaum and Leon Wolcott 78

Where Do We Go From Here?
Leander Boykin 97

Has Thorndike Lived In Vain?
Stephen G. Rich 102

Racial Attitude Survey As A Basis For
Community Planning
Stuart C. Dodd and Robert W. O'Brien 118

Editorial, 65

OCTOBER 1949

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

157 WEST 13TH ST., NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

Editorial Staff

E. GEORGE PAYNE, <i>Editor-in-Chief</i>	JOHN C. PAYNE, <i>Asst. Managing Editor</i>
DAN W. DODSON, <i>Managing Editor</i>	EVELYN F. DODSON, <i>Business Manager</i>
HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, FREDERIC M. THRASHER, STEPHEN G. RICH, I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, ESTHER HILTON, ETHEL ALPENFALS, <i>Associate Editors</i>	

Permanent Department

Book Reviews

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

Board of Trustees

E. GEORGE PAYNE, <i>President</i>	MAURICE MOFFATT
HERBERT D. HARPER, <i>Vice-President</i>	STEPHEN G. RICH
HENRY W. MEISSNER, <i>Secretary</i>	WILLIAM ROSENGARTEN, SR.
I. DAVID SATLOW, <i>Treasurer</i>	W. CLINTON STUART
DAN W. DODSON, <i>Managing Trustee</i>	

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, 157 West 13th St., New York 11, N.Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25, all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 23

October 1949

No. 2

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

AN EDITORIAL

One of the outstanding developments in higher education during the last decade has been the decline of the university as a research center. Corporations are finding it more desirable to establish their own research organizations than to "farm out" their work to the universities. Roper, Gallup, and others are finding it more convenient to set up separate organizations to do their work than to draw upon the universities. Government agencies have established their own research organizations to provide them with the informations needed to direct their programs.

Why should this situation come to pass? More people are matriculating for the doctorate every year. Every graduate school is literally flooded with candidates for doctorates. Certainly the reason for the decline of the university as a research center is not to be found in the dearth of persons aspiring to do research.

In this writers' opinion the reason for the decline is not to be found in the lower quality of the candidates. In the New York University School of Education where the number of doctoral candidates is at an all time high, candidacy for the doctorate represents only fifty per cent of those who apply. The others are eliminated through the best prognostic tests we have been able to devise. Truly the decline has been due neither to decline in manpower nor to

Copyright 1949, by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

the quality of those who apply for candidacy.

Undoubtedly many factors contribute to the decline of status of the university as a research center. The changed meaning of the doctorate is, no doubt, one factor. The doctorate was conceived originally as a research degree, but as requirements for college teachers were raised, the doctorate became a qualification for teaching rather than a qualification for research positions, and the pressure was turned on the graduate schools to grant doctoral degrees to those who teach. Then too, research has become an element in the competitive process, hence most businesses of size find it profitable to do research to keep them ahead of their competitors. Many agencies, including those of government, are finding it increasingly profitable to engage in research to provide both a basis of programming and a scientific evaluation of what their programs are producing.

Aside from these factors, however, an honest assessment must be made of the failure of the institutions of higher learning to keep pace with the new demands in research which the social changes have introduced into our society. The Ph. D. degree was evolved at a time when research patterns were simple. Competencies in research were not too highly specialized. Research techniques were not so refined. Above all, it was rarely conceived that research should provide anything useful except in physical science.

Today the picture on the social scene has changed. There are few projects of consequence where the student can undertake alone the type of dissertation which will be significant. Even in the field of physical science, the development of the Atomic Bomb indicated the trend which research is taking. The Manhattan Project required the skills of thousands of people. Whether they had degrees or not did not matter. The competencies required related to ability to do research, and what was equally important, an ability to work with other people to accomplish the task which had to be done.

The contrast of this project to the research in the average university shows at once what the weaknesses are. In spite of the fact that more degrees are granted each year than ever before, we know less of what we ought to be doing in education, and know less about what we have done, when we have done it, than ever before. If one were to ask what direction has been given to education and social agencies in and around New York by all the research which has been done in the last ten years, one would be compelled to "write most of it off" as a loss.

What is perhaps worse is that by the time the candidate has gone through the "mill" of securing a doctorate, he has had ground out of him whatever intellectual curiosity he may ever have had. Why should this be?

Perhaps the time has come when we should expect that our institutions of higher learning should devote their research resources to the elevation of the social life of the community. Perhaps the atomistic, piecemeal, study done in isolation should be superseded by the evolvment of broad designs of research in which graduate students with varied capacities will pool their talents to do types of researches which will have real significance. When Myrdal undertook the *American Dilemma* study he secured the services of four or five outstanding research men to do differing aspects of the work. His responsibility was that of providing the design, administering the project, and writing a final report which would pull together their findings, and give interpretation to them. In some comparable fashion the universities must sponsor researches that will have greater significance than has happened in the past, if they are going to justify their continued existence as research centers.

In education the problem is particularly acute. Education is one of America's greatest enterprises, and we cannot afford to let research—one of its most important elements—lag in this era of rapid change.

Dan W. Dodson

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN GERMANY*

Ernest O. Melby

One goes to Germany worried about Germany, and one comes back worried about the United States.

We went to Germany under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation with the purpose of exploring the wisdom and practicality of reestablishing the American Work Student Exchange between Germany and the United States. From 1925 to 1933, 500 men graduates of colleges and universities in Germany were brought to the United States to work in American industry and on American farms. They stayed here two years and then went back to Germany to become a part of the social fabric there. About 200 of them died in concentration camps or in the war. Some of them are still living in Germany and on this trip we made contact with about ninety of these and talked with them individually. I talked to at least thirty in rather extended conversation. These men had acquired a most exceptional understanding of American life—a far different conception of America than is acquired by the people who come here to study in the universities—or to travel. There is a sharp difference in the understanding of America shown by the people who have worked in our American economy, lived in American homes, eaten American food, thought and worked with the American people and seen America from the standpoint of active participants in the American social and economic structure.

The former work students had organized our trip before we arrived. As a result we were able to visit a number of cities that included Frankfort, Dusseldorf, Stuttgart, Bonn, Munich, Marburg, Heidelberg, Nurenberg, Essen,

* Editor's Note: This article was transcribed from an informal talk to members of the faculty of the School of Education of New York University after Dean Melby's return from a trip to Germany in April and May, 1949.

and Bochum. In each of these places we had not only one but several gatherings of local people. We talked to the burgomasters, to representatives of labor and industry, to former work students and to educational leaders. We had extended visits with the presidents of the universities of Heidelberg, Munich, Bonn, Göttingen and others. The military government helped to provide us with exceptional opportunities to know people in Germany, to talk to people who are working in the educational program and to see their attempts to solve their industrial, social, educational, and other reconstruction problems.

We lived in a sleeping car for the first five days. We had all our things in that car, and would go back to it in the evening, and during the night it would be hauled to another place. There were at times as many as forty people in our party, including Americans and Germans, former work students and educational leaders.

I think that the most overwhelming impression that is made on you in Germany is not the devastation of the bombing, although that is really terrific. Those of you who have seen it will, I am sure, agree with me that no picture, no movie, and no oral account of the bombing can give one an adequate impression of it. I must confess that it sickened me for a good deal of the time I was there. It wasn't until the last day I was there that I could go around and look at it without the feeling of near-nausea. The sight does something to you that you can't quite describe. The most overwhelming feeling you have while in Germany is the strategic place that Germany occupies in world affairs. Along with this you also become aware that you yourself have not given sufficient attention to Germany. Further reflection convinces you that the vast majority of the American people have made the same error. Viewing the situation in Germany as a whole, it dawns on you that in the last four years we in America have had one of the great opportunities of all time to strike an effective blow in defense of

democracy and freedom. Even after making all generous allowances, it must be admitted that we have largely thrown away this opportunity to go to the defense of democracy. We had a glorious chance to do something in the most strategic spot in all the world and what we did was of the too-little -and-too-late variety.

Many of you here know Dr. Alonzo Grace who is the present head of the Division of Education and Cultural Relations in Germany. He has now been on his job for a year and in that year he has almost performed miracles. A great deal has been accomplished. We have seen in Germany a wonderful testimony to the effectiveness of what we speak of as democratic leadership. The German people and educators are responding to that leadership in a most remarkable fashion. And if it could go on it would do wonderful things. Now there is a fear that as a result of the change-over from military to civilian control, this whole structure may topple. And the State Department may treat Germany just like it treats any other country and send one of the traditional educational and cultural relations staff to Germany. Such action would largely destroy the present program.

I referred to the strategic place that Germany occupies. You can't be over there very long without realizing that if Germany goes Communist and comes under the control of Russia, nothing can save the rest of Europe. I think that the chance of maintaining a free society in Europe if Germany goes totalitarian is so small that it is hardly worth thinking about. And by the same token if Germany can be kept free, the chance of keeping the whole continent free is immeasurably improved. I therefore believe that Germany is the most strategic single spot in the world today in the battle for freedom. There is no other place that is so important.

A lot can be said about the industrial picture. In the Ruhr, pig iron has already accumulated in great quantities

because there is no market for it, and steel production is now at the level of twelve million tons a year. This is a higher level than that allowed under the military regulations, and there will be curtailment in the balance of this year if we are to hold to the restrictions that have been set up. I saw one rolling mill being dismantled and an older one, a few hundred yards away, being refurbished. This was being done (according to the Germans) to give Germany a permanent reduction in steel production potentials in competition with England. It is perfectly clear that if the iron curtain stays down tight there will have to be curtailment. You can't blame the British if they are afraid of the competition because you can't keep the Ruhr going in the western zone alone.

I came away from this experience in Germany more convinced than ever that the notion that we can continue a permanent cold war between the East and the West isn't a practical thing. And more than that, it is no accident that the blockade is being lifted. I talked to at least five people who came over the border from the Eastern zone into the Western zone. They were intelligent men who had lived in America, had a pretty keen insight into world affairs, and were well-educated people of discernment. They said that the Russians were agreeing to lift the blockade because of the simple reason that they couldn't keep the thing going any longer. They just had their backs to the wall. I should be fair and say to you that there is always somebody sitting beside you who says, "Now don't believe any of these stories that come out of the Eastern zone." My own feeling is that those people are Communist-inspired. My impression is that conditions in the Eastern zone are bad. I think that the Russians knew that if they didn't lift the blockade very soon their whole system would be in such disrepute that their chance to spread it in Germany would be gone. It is common to hear, in the Western zone, that all you have to do to "cure" a Communist is to send him to the Eastern

zone for a few weeks. That may be an exaggeration, but there have been many instances of that kind. So I think that the lifting of the blockade came at a strategic time both for the East and for the West. Remember this isn't one-sided. I think the West needs the East too, but the East cannot be kept going as it was without contact with the West. And I came back with the feeling that probably the Russians are going to be more amenable to reason in the future than they have been, and that the outlook for peace is better than most of us believe it is here.

But let us not forget that in Germany today there is a great moral, spiritual and political vacuum. The average young German has little interest in political theory as such. He thinks all political parties futile. He thinks our political theory is just a set of high-sounding phrases. He thinks about the Russian theories. He was disillusioned with national socialism. Now he says, "Why should I believe in any political party?" The Germans in the main are disillusioned with the Church, regardless of whether it be Catholic, Lutheran, or Evangelical. I talked to Catholics and Protestants alike who were disappointed with the role played by their own respective churches in Germany. I don't think that you can do anything effective for Central Europe unless you can do something to fill in the spiritual and moral vacuum that exists there. You've got to give these people something in which to believe.

So we Americans presented the idea of democracy, and we said to the Germans, "This is what you should believe." The Germans can talk about democracy just as well as we can. The German educators who were making speeches to the German teachers sounded like they had been reading Dewey and Kilpatrick, and maybe they had. Their phraseology, their words, are just as good as ours. Yet they have little idea about what any of these things mean in action. You can't imagine how inexperienced these educators are when it comes to democratic procedures. The only thing

they do is lecture, and everybody looks up to them for answers. They don't know how to conduct a discussion meeting. A panel discussion is an utterly unheard of thing. Dr. Benjamin Fine and I tried at the conference at Chiemsee to organize a panel discussion at which I was supposed to be chairman. Even though we had had two planning sessions for it, it would end up as just a series of speeches. It is hard to imagine the poverty of democratic experience on the part of these German teachers.

All women's organizations in Germany were destroyed by Hitler except the YWCA. He just left a little skeleton of that. There are no channels in Germany today, through which women can exert any influence, except a few which have been revived under the American occupation. It is hard for any American to imagine the place of women in German society and their utter removal from any real participation in the affairs of the community.

It does little good to talk to the German people. It does no good to lecture them, absolutely no good. The only thing that will do any good in Germany is to sit down with the people and help them to plan some ways in which they can make their communities better places to live, and give them a real share in the doing of that thing.

I saw one thing going on in Germany that impressed me as being a democratic experience. Near Essen the workers in the Steel industry are building their own houses. They have organized to secure the land, to do the planning and to do the building with their own hands. They have organized their communities on a democratic basis. This was a wonderful, cooperative venture in which each person shares in a creative endeavor, and gets the feel of being an active participant in a really democratic situation for the first time in his life. That is an example of the kind of thing that we will have to do if we are ever going to democratize Germany. Talking about theory does no good. They either accept the democratic theory without knowing what it

means or they refuse to accept it (in which case you get nowhere) or they are completely disinterested in the whole business and say "Show me what it means in reality."

More than that, democracy falters in the world today when it comes to getting the attention of the masses of people who don't quite know what they believe. These people look either to the East or to the West, to totalitarianism or to democracy. Democracy ought to appeal to the masses of people around the globe far more than any statism. But democracy is very much like the church in one respect. The Christian church has allowed itself to become a stereotype. It is something which has little vital relation to the ongoing life of people. It has become a theory. So with democracy. For millions of people around the globe, it is a beautiful, high sounding theory that doesn't mean anything in bread and butter, in education, in housing, in a better life for the people in a community. If you want democracy to spread around the globe; if you want to capture the minds and hearts of people who are deciding which way to look, you have got to put some teeth in it. And if the church wants to hold people, it has got to get a program of some sort; it cannot be a mere theory, some ethereal piece of mysticism removed from the realities of the everyday experiences of people.

I came back from this experience convinced that the thing that is wrong with education in Germany is the same thing that is wrong with our education here at home. We have the same problems; but in Germany you see them in all their stark nakedness. Teacher education with us is ineffective because it is made up largely of lecture courses. We lecture to people about democratic experience, about democratic leadership. We fill people with facts and we hope that somehow these facts are going to result in changed behavior. Then we go out and look at the teachers in the schools and we find that they behave very much as if they had not had education in democracy. We wonder why their

education has not been effective.

If you want to see how ineffective academic education is in influencing behavior just go to Germany. In the United States we criticize our students, we criticize our standards. We say our students do not learn as much as they should; that standards aren't as high as they should be. Perhaps German students are better than our fondest dreams. They know their history. They know their philosophy. They know their geography. They know all these things that we want our students to learn and more. And what is the result? Not a single forward step in the way of social organization or improvement of life in the community! It is as sterile and meaningless in terms of social action as anything can be. You know what German education did. It did not do a thing to stop Hitler. These people who knew all these things, with all this erudition, stood idly by and let the storms blow.

I came away from this experience more convinced than ever that the academic acquisition of facts is as sterile and meaningless as anything can be in terms of social behavior. The mere fact that a man knows something is no guarantee that he is going to act wisely. We in America could redouble the effectiveness of our education, and particularly of our teacher education, if we would take half of the time that we are now spending on the acquisition of facts and put it into the acquisition of experience, into opportunities for boys and girls and men and women to share in the life of the community and actually learn by doing. Not only is that true of our teacher education but it is true of the whole democratic structure. Democracy is going to die on the vine unless we can find a way of vitalizing it at the community level. You cannot keep democracy alive with activities in Washington, in the capitol of your state, in areas that are far away and to which the individual has no direct or vital relationship. Democracy is going to be vitalized only if we can so organize it that the individual citizen feels that he is

identified with the social structure and an effective working part of that structure. And that is the world-wide problem confronting democratic societies.

We need a grand strategy for American democracy in a world in which free institutions are at bay and literally fighting with their backs to the wall. We have no such grand strategy. If we had, we would not have let things go the way we have in Germany. More than that, we must realize that the world is suffering from a moral and spiritual vacuum more than from anything else and that we can't lift it out of its present plight through economics alone. We have got to give people something in which to believe, or no amount of economic help is going to do any good in the long run. And we will not give the people something in which to believe by preaching. We will give people something in which to believe only when we can relate them in a vigorous and vital fashion to some ongoing project or activity in the community of which they themselves are a part. And if the church wants to reestablish itself in Europe and on a worldwide basis it must stop mere preaching and begin action, begin giving the people of these communities the feeling that it has something to offer beyond theory.

Many people have asked, what is the political complexion of Germany? You know, there are no Nazis in Germany today. They have miraculously disappeared. Nobody wants to be a Nazi. You cannot find anybody who will now say that he was a Nazi. If he was a Nazi he was only nominally a Nazi. There *are* substantial democratic elements in Germany who are sincerely struggling to do something. It is impossible for anybody to say how numerous they are, but one thing is certain: we must help these democratic elements to come to the surface in the way of leadership, and keep them there, or nationalism is going to return. There is almost universal agreement that if nationalism comes back this time, it will come back under Communist rather than under Rightist auspices.

I might say that we had an interview with Conrad Adenauer, the chairman of the Bonn Constituent Assembly. We spent some time with Carlos Schmidt of the Social Democratic party. We talked to representative leaders of almost all the various political groups and I came away with the feeling there are in Germany substantial elements of people looking in democratic directions. But they have a great lack of experience in democratic action. And I hope that we will stay in Germany for a cultural and educational relations program for the next 20 or 25 years. I think that is what it will take. It is going to take that much time to give these people enough experience with democratic processes so that they can really stand on their own feet.

One thing I think we should be ashamed of: throughout the academic life of America we have said too often to people when they asked if they could be relieved to go to Germany or to Japan, "No, we can't spare you." The result is that instead of having the first team over there, we often have the third or the fourth. And we should have the ablest people. If, when the war was over, we had looked over America and picked a dozen or two of the most outstanding people we had, and said to them "Now this is your job because this is the most vital front in the world," by now we could have made enormous gains. Such a move would have done much to support us here at home and to support the things in which we believe on a world wide basis.

As I said in the beginning, I went to Germany worried about Germany and I came back worried about the U. S. I see in the perspective of this experience in Germany that we have not yet grown up to the stature demanded of us if we are going to be the world leader that our geography, our economic resources and our idealological heritage all converge to thrust upon us. We can grow to the required stature only if our education and community life both take on the vital qualities of democratic life and action.

Dr. Ernest O. Melby is Dean of the School of Education at New York University.

HUMAN RELATIONS EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS THROUGH THE INSTITUTE TYPE COURSE

Max Birnbaum

Leon B. Wolcott

INTRODUCTION

Specialists in Human Relations education are in general agreement that the most effective medium for in-service education of teachers in their field is the summer workshop. In the workshop, they hold, fundamental changes in attitudes are effected by combining experience in group living with an atmosphere conducive to both emotional and intellectual re-education. The workshop, however, is designed to serve only a few of the many teachers who desire to learn new techniques and develop insights leading to effective practice. Moreover, if the present trend continues, workshops in human relations will devote more attention to leadership training and less to the classroom teacher who wishes to improve her own teaching and class management. Therefore, the great need, at present, is for a type of training to reach large numbers of teachers, without sacrificing the advantages of the workshop.

To meet this need, the Rutgers University School of Education has been offering for the past two years an in-service course entitled Foundations Of Human Relations Education. This course designed and administered by the authors, has been conducted in various parts of the State of New Jersey.

The development of a successful course was not a simple task. In few areas of education is the material so threatening psychologically to the basic predispositions of many teachers. It was necessary to learn how to win sanction for these emotional and intellectual learnings; how to create the permissive atmosphere necessary for productive group dis-

cussion of highly controversial concepts and issues, and above all, how to close the gap between intellectual acceptance and actual practice. Such treatment was essential if the course were to be even partially as effective as a workshop.

The major challenge, obviously, was the gap between the passive acceptance of ideas and intelligent action based upon them. It was also clear that intellectual and emotional acceptance of basic concepts would not be secured solely through verbal means, for experience indicates that relatively few accept the word alone. Therefore, a combination of *verbal presentation* and "action research" is used here, rather than the term paper, because the intent was to suggest simple research procedures demanding remedial action or constructive change by the teacher. Insights into the laws of learning suggest that "fact finding" by the teacher herself threatens her self-esteem less than would a comparable analysis of her behavior by an outsider, however impartial and authoritative. Such self exploration minimizes rationalization and augurs well for effective change. These "jobs" were never to be considered as examples of scholarly, controlled research using all the carefully validated data and other paraphernalia of the social sciences.

The experience of the American Council On Education Project: Intergroup Education in Cooperating Schools* was sufficiently rich in practical demonstrations of the value of "action research" to warrant our initial experimentation, but there yet remained the serious question as to whether these jobs could be controlled in a course meeting for one hour and forty-five minutes a week with occasional individual and small group conferences. Compared with the American Council staff's frequent half or full day confer-

* The American Council On Education Project was financed by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The Director for the life of the project was Dr. Hilda Taba now of the University of Chicago.

ences with small groups of teachers over a three year period, it appeared doubtful that "action research" would yield even a small part of the benefit, because of the necessarily limited course time. Experiences with six separate sections of this course with a total enrollment of 436 prove that the decision to use "action research" was a happy one.

The course was the Institute-type involving an instructor-coordinator as well as specialists in child development, sociology, social psychology and curriculum philosophy. Several considerations dictated this design. In the *first* place, the instructor-coordinators could not claim the Aristotelian intellect which encompasses the needed knowledge and expertness in the disciplines cited. *Secondly*, sanction for the new field of human relations education could be provided by the inclusion of a number of prominent authorities in various fields. Although these "experts" often differed in their interpretations of basic concepts, they always warmly commended the course and indicated their approval and support of human relations education.

The final challenge was the creation of a relaxed, permissive atmosphere in which the participants would feel free to discuss topics which are frequently met with taboo, "the less said about it the less trouble we will have." To bring about such an atmosphere it was necessary to employ much of the experience gathered in workshop situations. In the beginning, attention was focused on relatively non-controversial ideas which acted as a safe point of departure when topics involving group conflict were discussed. Attempts by participants or consultants to focus exclusive attention upon racial or religious tensions, were firmly opposed and the discussion brought back to a consideration of the total picture. This insistence was rewarded eventually in each of the six sections of the course by the diminution of tension when highly complex problems of conflict were analyzed.

The remainder of the article will deal with the subject mat-

ter of the course, the problems and hazards in administration and teaching incident to it, an evaluation of the results, and some general implications for teacher education.

CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE-TYPE COURSE IN HUMAN RELATIONS

While there is need to fashion the course content in human relations to the needs of the teachers involved, and to the special competencies of available consultants, there is no excuse for nebulousness or whimsy. There are four fields of knowledge which very clearly pertain to the problems in this area. The materials presented are drawn, however, from fields of scholarship so rich that no one planning a course need feel hampered in his choices. The materials may be arranged with one exception, in whatever fashion best contributes to scheduling of consultants. The four fields from which we made our choices are: (1) Anthropology (both physical and social) and Sociology; (2) Child study and human development; (3) Psychology, Social Psychology, and Psychiatry; and (4) Curriculum Development. The least flexible of these four fields — Curriculum Development — should be reserved as the final topic for treatment, since the devising of curricular experiences for students depends heavily upon insights gained from "action research", reading and discussion in the other three fields. In planning topics to be presented under each of these four major categories, considerable acquaintance with each of them is required if a fanciful eclecticism is to be avoided. Such a breadth of learning does not, however, demand that the instructor-coordinator be a research specialist in all, or even in any, of them.

The content of such a course utilizes materials which are either omitted in programs of teacher education, or are offered as electives for which there is all too little time. The relationship between the several areas of knowledge is seldom pointed up and even less frequently is their utility

in teaching demonstrated. It has been our purpose to introduce materials from these various disciplines and give them functional integration. In summarizing what we have done, no attempt has been made to fix a rigid pattern, since the variety, depth and richness of such a course could be greatly extended if time and talent were available.

It has been our experience that a discussion of the child in his total social setting is essential. In the not so remote past, there has been a frequent absence of emphasis on the influence of the group in the child's development in much of the material written in this field. This omission needs to be offset by careful consideration of the "group dynamics" forces which operate within the family, the play group, the clique, the gang, the neighborhood, the subtle classroom groupings, as well as those which operate in larger cultural groupings such as those of races, ethnic groups, religions, and social classes. Consequently we directed our emphasis on how the child acts and inter-acts as a member of his peer group, stressing factors of conformity, non-conformity, rewards and punishments.

Sociometric techniques, we have discovered, afford one of the most effective ways of studying the structure and dynamics of children's groups. A great deal is learned from them about the personalities and behavior problems of individual children.

Sociodrama was an extremely useful tool for studying the behavior of children. In playing the roles of adults such as parents, neighbors, teachers and police officers, the child clearly reveals how his behavior is conditioned by the groups with which he has interactive contacts. Sociodrama likewise proved to be a mirror for teachers in which they discovered in themselves behavior tendencies of which they were previously unaware.

Several other ways of studying child development were incorporated in this course. Teachers were instructed in keeping anecdotal records, the use of non-directive inter-

viewing, and the systematic study of the family and community backgrounds of the members of a class. Teachers, we soon learned, looked upon home visitation as an unwelcome, disagreeable, or even dangerous encounter in which they must never forget to play the "teacher" role, and often an unpleasant mission because some boy or girl has been "bad" or is "failing." With the aid of the non-directive type of interviewing many a teacher has become "equal to the situation" and has derived both pleasure and profit from sallying forth from her own fortress of academic isolation into the social milieu of the child.

While some attention to attitude testing would seem to be imperative in the field of Human Relations, the results of the testing techniques now available are so dubious that only cursory mention was made of these instruments. Since the techniques used in "depth psychology" are risky except in the hands of those who have extensive and specialized training, we considered it wise to do no more than to call attention to these techniques.

The whole field of human development lends itself very effectively to "action research" which is so vital to a course of this type. A factual presentation of sociometry, for example, was followed by work sessions and the teachers then started to work independently on their own research projects. Once the teacher has been introduced to techniques, she soon becomes aware of many problems in her own classroom which can be clarified and, in part at least, solved through "action research." Often her examination of her own classroom brings forth spontaneous suggestions for "action research."

The major source of factual materials in human relations lies in the social science disciplines of Sociology and Social Anthropology. We, therefore, explored the nature and dynamics of human groups to provide an intellectual framework and adequate vocabulary for use in the field. It is not ordinarily possible to do more than attempt a sketchy

summary of the basic concepts, trusting that whatever reading is done is adequately supplementary. It seemed wise to us to stress the dynamic aspects of group life at the expense of structural theory.

Since so many of the problems in this area are racial, or what is often erroneously thought to be racial, we first attempted to clarify the topic by summarizing the findings of the most reputable physical anthropologists. We endeavored to differentiate between races, ethnic groups, nationalities, religious groups, and other types of groups often indiscriminately jumbled. While there is some controversy over the use of the term "caste" when applied to American society, we considered its employment sufficiently widespread to warrant its careful examination.

One of the concepts which seems to be most threatening to teachers is that of social class. Nevertheless we have found that teachers can be helped to understand children by studying those wide variations in the folkways, mores, values, aspirations, and meaningful symbols in the class structure of our society which are in some way connected with socio-economic status, ancestry, and style of living. The tendency of most teachers to evaluate child behavior in the light of such social facts is undeniable. It seems to shock them only when it is systematically and objectively analyzed. Our explorations along these lines decreased the tendency of teachers to act judgmentally in narrowly ethical terms when dealing with persons of other racial, religious, or socio-economic groups. This fact would in itself justify consideration of the American status system.

The community, however, is more than a collection of dynamically related persons belonging to different social classes. The ecological patterns of a community's life, the power groups which fashion its destiny, the institutions and associations which serve the human needs of its inhabitants, and the subtler cultural factors, many indigenous to American culture in general but possessing regional

and local variants, which set the style of a community's living, were given consideration. This was not done in a theoretical vacuum. We sought to discover in a specific community what groups and what persons count for most, how they came by their power, how they exercise it, and by what means such influence is perpetuated. In unraveling the tangled skein of power relationships through "action research" many teachers for the first time related themselves to those persons who can be most useful in helping the schools to help boys and girls.

The dynamic study of groups involves the findings of psychologists, social psychologists, and psychiatrists. The principal problem in this area is that of analyzing prejudice and discriminatory behavior and determining how the underlying attitudes, values, and sentiments are formed in people's minds. The results of research in this field revealed many answers. Whence do prejudices come, at what age, and for what purpose? Are they the result of social pressures or are they the psychological answer to some deep inner need, even at times pathological in its nature? What part do the agencies of communication play in perpetuating or negating them? Are the psychological motivations of members of the so-called minority groups in any way different from those of the majority? Is any difference which exists one of degree only or is it qualitative as well? Where, when, and how can steps be taken to reduce prejudice and discrimination? What part does emotional re-learning play in such a process? How rapidly can change be achieved and how permanent and far reaching can it reasonably be expected to be? Can all persons surrender their prejudices without doing damage to their total personality structure? On the positive side, what are the traits of the person reasonably free from bias? How common or how rare are such persons in our culture? Is their number in all likelihood increasing or diminishing? Psychological monographs, public opinion studies, and the published results of

psychiatric investigations were among the sources tapped.

Elaborate, controlled experiments in this area are hardly practicable for the classroom teacher. Relatively simple, rule-of-thumb research projects were found to be feasible. Observations of discrimination as it is practiced in the community were made and even roughly quantified. Practicable means of reducing discrimination and insuring fuller participation of all the school's population in the life of the community when it reaches adulthood were devised.

Finally, we endeavored to develop a sound philosophy of curriculum construction and explored the various techniques by which a curriculum is actually formulated. All of the preceding learnings would have been sterile had we not helped teachers to translate them into constructive learning experiences for children.

It was made clear that Human Relations materials should be incorporated into the curriculum in as many places as possible where it can be done logically and appropriately. It was necessary to belabor the point that they should neither be added as extra units nor artificially and forcibly joined as addenda to otherwise complete learning units. Since the Social Studies and the Language Arts are subject matter areas particularly appropriate for incorporating such materials, special attention was paid to both of them.

Since the human warmth and personal quality of literature not only sensitizes, but also provides a spring-board for intimate and self-revealing discussion, teachers were shown how it can legitimately be used for heightening both self and group understanding. Typical courses in American Culture in both its historical and contemporary aspects were investigated for a fuller understanding of the problems and tensions of today. How teachers of Literature and Social Studies teachers can work cooperatively in increasing the understanding of Human Relations was a problem given careful consideration.

While the Language Arts and the Social Studies are the disciplines most frequently used in furthering better human relations, we made it plain that the curriculum must be viewed in its totality. Music and art, the biological and physical sciences, shop courses, the physical education program, as well as the "home room" program and the legion of activities—once considered "extracurricular" were explored as to how they can contribute to a well integrated program.

This summarization of the content of the institute-type of course in Human Relations is not to suggest that it is definitive or ever should be. There may well be wide variations in the choice of materials. We are merely saying that the four broad areas enumerated seem to us after some experience to be the best guide lines in planning such a course. They are reasonably comprehensive and at the same time permit planning a course which can be offered within the time limits of a single semester.

PROBLEMS AND HAZARDS INVOLVED IN CONDUCTING THE INSTITUTE-TYPE COURSE IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Personnel is always of great importance in social engineering. The instructor-coordinator, as already suggested, must be familiar with many areas of knowledge and be able to analyze critically the contributions of the various specialists. He is far more than a moderator; he must knit together psychologically his own group and the various consultants and employ them to the greatest benefit of his group.

Permissiveness in the class situation is very necessary. One must start with people where they are, utilizing group members wherever possible to give sanction to what is being said and done. The coordinator must have great patience and freedom from dogmatism.

The consultants, must, first of all, be persons whose scholarship is of a very high order. But that is not enough

for they must also be lively popularizers. While "big names" may attract people to a course, teachers are likely to be dissatisfied if the consultants are pedantic, take too much for granted, offer few or no practical suggestions which teachers can use, or evade their questions. The use of highly technical and esoteric language in particular annoys teachers who are rarely specialists in the consultant's field. It may prove somewhat difficult to secure consultants of the calibre necessary if the location of the course is too far removed from a large metropolitan center or reputable colleges and universities. The expense must also be borne in mind, for fees and travelling expenses of consultants can be considerable. The experience of the Rutgers University School of Education indicates however, that, despite this fact, such courses are exceptionally profitable, both financially and in terms of goodwill, since participants feel—as we shall see later—that a real educational service is being performed. Moreover, it will be found that many top-notch people so believe in the value of the work that their services can be procured at very nominal fees.

It is essential in such a course to discover what are the major needs of the group. While it may not be possible to meet all of them, it is very necessary not to push them aside. Special meetings composed of special interest groups or committees chosen from the larger group have proved very useful in meeting specific needs.

Since "action research" projects hold so important a place in a course of this type, they deserve special consideration. Some teachers prefer to write a paper by consulting library sources from which they can quote liberally. The results sound erudite and they do not have to get their "feet wet" by jumping into the main stream problems. Such persons are likely to feel that little "action research" projects would be too narrow and insignificant. On the other hand, it must be noted that many teachers welcome projects of this sort. They have grown weary of made-work of

dubious scholarly value which has no direct bearing upon the everyday problems which they face in the classroom.

Every effort has been made to keep the reading in the course on a functional level. To achieve this goal recommended materials presented findings of recent research which are not readily available to most teachers. Little or no attempt was made to set up uniform reading assignments. Participants were encouraged to select their reading independently, allowing their felt needs and deficiencies and the special interests engendered in the pursuit of "action research" to guide their choices.

There are a number of things which teachers seem to find threatening in a course of this type. The general atmosphere of permissiveness is strange and they seem to resent the absence of authoritarian answers to questions. Moreover, the freedom from fixed weekly assignments and a final examination tend to leave teachers at times with a "lost" feeling. The student-teacher relationship of co-learners in exploration is to many a new experience.

That the factual content of the course too has proved threatening to some teachers has been mentioned before. The frank and objective discussions of racial, religious, ethnic, social class, and sexual differences inhibits some participants. Some teachers suffer psychological discomfort when their "practice" of democratic concepts is questioned. We have discovered that to postpone discussion of the more threatening topics until the course is well under way to allow adequate opportunity for cathartic self-expression does much to minimize this particular hazard.

Finally, the physical setting in which such a program is carried on is important. Regular classrooms are not too satisfactory. If it be possible, a circular or semi-circular arrangement of seats is preferable to one in straight rows. A formal lecture situation in which the speaker is placed on a raised platform with a lectern should be avoided since it increases the social distance between him and the group

Informality and congeniality are much to be sought. It is desirable to use a room where teachers may smoke if they choose, where they can feel free and relaxed, and where minds meet in the genial exchange of ideals. It has proved wiser to choose an evening hour for the meetings than the period immediately following the school day when teachers are weary and deserve a respite.

"THE PROOF OF THE PUDDING"

In each of the sections of the course taught to date some effort was made to evaluate at least the immediate effects upon the participants. Evaluation was made especially difficult because it was impossible to maintain consistent and intimate contact with the school systems represented by the participants. Much of the evaluation was perforce subjective in nature. Factors such as the degree to which the group atmosphere became permissive, the growth in the ease with which psychologically threatening concepts were discussed, and the warmth of the group response to the instructor-coordinator and the several consultants had, unfortunately, to be assessed in such a subjective manner. In every respect the general morale and reactive behavior of the participants appeared to the instructors to be superior to that encountered in traditional courses. Attendance was remarkably high even in the face of, in one instance, a hazardous ice storm which disrupted transportation and community life for several days.

Two additional sources of evaluative data were less subjective in nature. First were the reports on the "action research" undertaken by the participants which included summarizations not only of what action had been taken but also of the results. Second were the unsigned statements from the participants in which they were asked to list specific instances of how the course had helped to bring about changes in their own behavior, in classroom management, in the school as a whole, and in the community at large.

These were sufficiently circumstantial to preclude doubt as to their validity. These "testimonials" were solicited on a voluntary basis and it was suggested that they be typed before submission in order to avoid any attempt to curry favor with the instructor. A remark such as the following reveals a characteristic participant reaction. "I can honestly say that no other course in Education has ever had such direct effect on my classroom teaching. Other courses have been just as enriching and personally rewarding to me, but their effect had little to do with teaching." The "action research" aspect of the course was evaluated by one participant in the following fashion: "The work type project is a welcome substitute for the old type term paper. How I labored over them only to scrap them at the end of the term. On the other hand, I am still working on sociometrics and shall continue to do so."

To be more specific we shall classify the responses from participants under the following headings: (1) changes in the behavior of individual teachers and students, (2) changes in the atmosphere and management of the classroom, (3) changes that affected the entire school, (4) changes in the relations between schools, (5) changes in the relations between the school and the community, and (6) those more sweeping changes that are felt in the community as a totality.

Many teachers felt that "problem children" came to have fewer problems. Isolate children, slow learners, self-segregated groups of children, and hyper-active, domineering children have all been observed to adjust more effectively in the life of the classroom. One teacher writes: "A bully who used to jeer at a Jewish boy now goes to lunch with him daily." After using the sociometric technique another teacher reports: "I have a little boy in my room who, up until this time, had never spoken a complete sentence in the classroom. Whenever he wanted anything, he would just motion and make hand signs. He was placed next to the

leader of the boys. About three weeks later he began to say very short sentences to him. Now he will ask for things verbally but not in complete sentences. I feel he will be doing this soon. This may seem insignificant to those who are not familiar with the problem but it means a great deal to me." Teachers increasingly used social adjustment as well as scholastic achievement as a basis for grade placement and found many "problem children" yielding pleasantly to the pressures of a more congenial group.

Teachers found it a bit more difficult to express what had happened to themselves. There was, however, a marked increase in self-awareness. As one teacher put it, "I have not in the past recognized the reasons for some of my attitudes and methods until after-analysis." Their awareness of problems in the immediate environment tended to become emotional as well as intellectual and they found themselves becoming more cautious about making judgmental generalizations. An interesting comment by one teacher bearing on this point runs as follows: "This course has helped me to become more tolerant about the behavior problems of children coming from the lower socioeconomic levels of living. I realize that their sense of values and code of morals are different from mine. I now know that I cannot make them bridge the gap from their lower to my middle class concepts as the result of a quick miracle. I will become less preachy." It is quite clear that the practice of viewing both children and parents as persons has become more common. Teachers saw similar changes in their students as the following testimony indicates. "They now evidence a healthily questioning attitude toward all statements made about people, either derogatory or complimentary" and "they have stopped that everlasting laughing at anything that seems a little different." Unsuspected leadership qualities were discovered in many students. The construction of a sociogram often proved to teachers how erroneous their personal judgments had been in spotting the leaders in groups of students. Through interviews they sought to learn on what

grounds children made their choices and were helped to understand and work with, rather than against, the group dynamics of the child culture.

Classroom changes included greater permissiveness and changes in methods of formulating and executing new topics. One teacher writes: "I have changed the procedure for selecting committees and topics for class work. Now the children select the committees and the topics instead of my appointing the committees and choosing the topics. I have found that much better work has been accomplished and that the pupils are more anxious and interested in doing the assignments." Similar changes in practice were described. Several teachers reported abandonment of homogeneous grouping in their classes on the basis of sex, academic ability, and socio-economic status.

Literature was used more often and more effectively in sensitizing children to problems in human relations. For example, in a high school shop course attention was called to the provisions of New Jersey's Fair Employment Practice Act, the social skills necessary to "get along" on the job and in the community, and the social agencies in the community which might prove useful to students, particularly members of minority groups, once they have left school and have secured employment. Greater attention has been given to individual interests of students in hobbies, games, the arts, etc.; when they have educational value or can help the child win a place for himself in the classroom group. The increase in flexibility both as to content and method seems to have added appreciably to the security feelings of the students.

Interest in the course has proved to be contagious in those schools from which the participants have come. This made it easy for participants to enlist the cooperation of fellow staff members in carrying out a variety of projects. Teachers as well as students thus became better acquainted whether it was in the presentation of a radio quiz program, inter-class visitation, or inter-school visitation. Such ex-

periences have been found to be particularly valuable where Negro and white children have shared experiences, often for the first time.

One particularly interesting experiment in a shore community involved a very carefully planned visit to the non-segregated Senior High School by entire classes of Negro students on the Junior High School level. The report on this project indicates that both groups reaped benefits of real importance from the visits.

Another project which has community-wide significance was incidental to a testimonial dinner given by the Board of Education, the teachers, and city officials honoring the Vice-President of the Board, who was a Negro. The dinner was served jointly by white and Negro students, something that previously never has been heard of in this particular community. As one teacher wrote, "Everyone worked agreeably together." Another teacher reporting on the same activity described it as follows: "The girls were scared when they first entered the dining room. White girls and colored girls were holding each other's hands to give each other courage. The girls helped each other in many ways during the serving. Afterwards, they said that they were looking forward to attending high school. They were glad to meet girls from other schools so that they would know more people when they got to high school. All agreed that they had a wonderful time and would like to do it again."

The ways in which such a course may indirectly involve an entire community are numerous. In making a shop course more effective it was found necessary to establish connections with the Anti-Discrimination Division of the New Jersey Department of Education, the Veteran's Administration, local political leaders and city officials, group work agencies such as the Y.M.C.A. and Y.M.H.A., contractor's associations, and labor unions. The "apprenticeship committee" involved members of the union, members of the contractor's association, and the teacher of the shop course who represented the interests of all his students,

both Negro and white. When engaged in a program of this sort, the school becomes a functional community institution promoting better human relations affecting the prosperity and happiness of the entire population of a city.

The accumulated evidence of changes in school practice and teacher and student behavior is sufficiently convincing to warrant the conclusion that a course of this type does go far toward bridging the gap between intellectual acceptance and actual practice. It is apparent that this objective is not peculiar to Human Relations education alone but is equally demanded by other areas of teacher education. In the final and concluding section an attempt will be made to explore the nature of the implications of "action research."

IMPLICATIONS FOR GENERAL TEACHER EDUCATION

As indicated above, the need to bridge the gap between *classroom theorization* and *field practice* is by no means restricted to Human Relations education. Indeed, courses in child study, community analysis, guidance, general educational sociology, to name but a few, could and should develop a similar structure. Proponents of orthodox presentation may argue that students have left their classes inspired with new insights which have promptly been translated into action. It is not necessary, they would probably insist, to develop an elaborate series of projects to effect the identical results. It would be foolhardy to deny their assertions *en toto*; in fact one could cite instances which support their case. However, where changes in practice depend upon a change in teacher behavior, the educational milieu must be so structured that the desirable new insights or opportunities for changes in behavior are not left entirely to chance.

If, for example, courses in child study and community analysis were redesigned to effect the objectives stressed above, both should gain tremendously practical usefulness. The child study course might deal less with lectures on general theory and more with "action research" proj-

ects the result of which could supply a desirable framework for theoretical discussion. Interesting and rewarding ways of observing and recording individual and group behavior among children such as sociometry, socio-drama, open-ended questions, non-directive interviewing, functional anecdotal recording, pupil diaries, simple adaptations of the Murray Thematic Apperception Test, and similar projective techniques are but a few of the "action-research" tools available. The class under the instructor's guidance could help in the analysis and interpretation of data obtained by participants. Supplementary lectures stressing theory and basic research findings would then surely have a more meaningful frame of reference.

Community analysis could be treated in a like manner. Projects involving a look at how the community rewards its differing socio-economic strata, community power lines and their implications for education, direct observation of pupil behavior in community situations out of school, analysis of conflicts between school and community values are but a few of the areas which suggest themselves for treatment.

Contrast between a course stressing "action research" and one emphasizing the lecture-discussion-term paper triad can be endless but the writers' experiences with both types of approaches dictate their firm conviction that the former is of greater effect. Definitive conclusions must obviously await a controlled evaluation which would compare the short term and long range effects of both. While awaiting this evaluation, the writers propose to expand the institute-type course utilizing "action research," confident that their joint experience thus far justifies their assumption that the results of scientific evaluation will validate the hypotheses implicit in this article.

Max Birnbaum is Co-Director of Rutgers University Human Relations Workshop and Chairman of the Social Studies Department, Weequatic High School, Newark, New Jersey.

Leon Wolcott is Co-Director of Rutgers University Human Relations Workshop and Assistant Professor of Sociology, Trenton State Teachers College, Trenton, New Jersey.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(A Social and Educational Prospectus)

Leander Boykin

Modern society is in one of the major transitional periods of human experience. Individually and collectively the peoples of the civilized world are torn between the complex and dynamic character of science and technology on the one hand, and faith in human intelligence and the good-will of men on the other.

The most characteristic aspect of our civilization, and that which makes our age inevitably transitional in character, is the amazing contrast between the material and the non-material factors in our culture. Ours is an age of unprecedented speed, powerful and secret weapons of war, and unlimited means of production. It is likewise an age of skepticism, distrust, moral chaos, political butchery, and seemingly of educational futility. If society awakens in time and closes the gulf between science and technology on the one hand, and social thinking and institutions on the other, we may literally "inherit the earth." However, if we continue along the road to war as we appear to be headed at present, there is little likelihood of preserving civilization for more than another generation. Our unique mechanical and scientific inventions have created, perhaps unwittingly, grave responsibilities. Unless we shoulder them, we may soon enter another Dark Age — perhaps more retrogressive than that which followed the decline of the Roman Empire.

Democracy is facing a critical situation. We stand on the threshold of being swamped with numerous and complex problems with which our machinery of government is not designed to cope. Dependence and reliance of the national state — upon a bellicose psychology, the atom bomb, new life killing bacteria, or super bombers and fighters can

wreck civilization. This rich heritage of ours has withstood mass thievery and incompetence, but it cannot withstand the inadequate and shopworn political agility of many of our national leaders. Many of our actions are incompatible with democracy. Living in a fool's paradise, we are stubbornly refusing to admit that anything is wrong with democracy in this era of big, dynastic, imperialistic, states. The question of maintaining peace, decency, and prosperity is now too immediate, too critical to continue such a course. The gravest immediate danger facing us is the possibility of being involved in another futile war.

Education, like society and democracy, is also in a parlous stage. There was a time when everything seemed secure, and settled. There never was such a time of course. One never did "get an education" at school. But we thought they did and were fairly happy. Most of us are unhappy today because few things are settled, and we do not seem able to get anywhere the kind of education needed. Such an education may be found, someday, but it does not appear on the horizon at present. Today we have the problem but not the answer. Social chaos is all about us — locally, nationally, internationally. Education cannot escape this fact, however much it may try.

That education should concern itself with problems of contemporary life, and that far-reaching demands are being made upon education by our changing society have been set forth and discussed by many leading educators of our time. They point out that a new situation exists; that the times in which we live demand that individuals think for themselves. They emphasize the need for critical-mindedness, science teaching, specialization, aggregation, social integration and the preservation of democracy. They point out that education is in life and for life. They argue that the goal of education is to continue to enrich this life process by better thought and act, and that continued

growth is its essence and end. The older philosophies and concepts, they contend, had external goals and set up ends or aims either outside of life altogether, or at any rate outside the life of the learner.

Now that as we face a world changing very rapidly, philosophy, it would seem, must somehow base itself on change or admit it's unwillingness to be a force in life's affairs.

The historical record shows that education is always a function of time, place and circumstances. In its basic philosophy, its social objective, and its program of instruction, it inevitably reflects in varying proportion the experience, the condition, the hopes, the fears, and the aspirations of a particular people or cultural group at a particular point in history. In actuality, it is never organized and conducted with sole reference to absolute and universal terms.

While the biological inheritance of the race presumably remains practically unchanged from age to age and thus gives a certain stability to the learning process, education as a whole is always relative, at least in fundamental parts, to some concrete and evolving social situation. It possesses no inner logic or empirical structure of its own that dictates either its method or content. In both its theoretical and practical aspects, it expresses the ideals of some given society at some given period of time, either consciously with clear design or half-consciously with hidden and confused purpose. There can be no all embracing educational philosophy, policy or program suited to all cultures and all ages. If this is true, there are no established and enduring educational aims and objectives. The view that education should seek to preserve educational aims and objectives of the past has been sharply challenged and such educators as Rugg, Bode, Childs, and Raup, who are vigorous critics of the proposal to have education revert to the past for its direction and guidance. They hold that the first duty of the school and the educative process is to improve society; that

it is not enough to enable the child to adjust himself to a social order which is weak in many places, but that the school must play a leading part in changing existing social situations. Rugg urges that the central theme of the new education be the regeneration and improvement of our social order through an education which will equip persons to undertake the reconstruction of community and national life. He feels that thorough-going reconstruction is demanded, and that the only institution known to man that can compass the problem is education. Professor Kimball Young sets forth some of the significant ways in which the school fails to keep up, to say nothing of leading, social change. He contends that of all institutions, the school lags farthest behind and gives to the new generation the learning of the past, often long after that learning has been outlawed by science and time. The traditional functions of education should be discarded, he suggests, and our entire educational system revamped in keeping with the times in which we are living.

The issue is further discussed by Ulich. Under the caption, "Toward What Ends Do We Educate," he contends that, "since in reality there is nothing to which growth is relative save more growth, there is nothing to which education is subordinate save more education." But he does point out that education needs and must have an aim, but that aim must be internal and not external, and that education depends upon and should be shaped in accordance with the general character of a period. He states rather emphatically that "mankind are by no means agreed about the things to be taught, whether we look to virtue or the best life." Neither is it clear whether education is more concerned with intellectual or with moral virtue. The existing practice is perplexing; no one knows on what principle we should proceed — should the useful in life, or should virtue, or should high knowledge be the aim of our train-

ing." He further states in his discussion of the "Problem of Values," that "the prolongation of outworn forms of life means a slow decadence in which there is repetition without fruit in the reaping of value. There may be high survival power. For decadence, undisturbed by originality or by external forces, is a slow process."

Society never has and never will be in a state of complete equilibrium. Education, therefore, has the right to do even more than educate youth toward the recognition and the realization of those values essential for the development of mankind; it must also take into consideration the present and future. True enough there can be no lasting or real education that does not include some genuine discipline — of the moral and intellectual nature of the individual, but the kind of discipline we need is not that emphasized as an aim and objective of past educational periods. We need to emphasize the cultural aspects of education, but not as they were emphasized by those in earlier times. We need ethical training. But religion and morals as emphasized by the Church when it dominated and controlled education have no place in our present society as enduring and lasting aims and objectives of education.

What we must do is to set up as our ideal an organization of society that shall allow the fullest development of every human being regardless of race, religion, social or economic circumstance. We must build our educational institutions in such a manner that this ideal is directly experienced as a way of living. We must therefore strive to make the school into a functioning community in living relationship with the larger community outside — local, state, regional, national and international.

We all agree that education has a right to be heard. The trouble is that no one quite seems to know what it is trying to do. At what shall education aim? At what shall schooling, that limited part of education, aim? The scholastics

answer one thing; the scientists another; the culturists a third thing; the man of affairs a fourth. There are many parties in the American educational world today and of course they do not all speak quite the same speech. But let us hope that there may soon emerge out of the present state of uncertainty and confusion a conception of human life, and aims and objectives of education to which our bewildered civilization and society can cling as a means of salvation and hope for the future.

There has never been a period in American history when there was so great an opportunity socially and educationally to move ahead to better things. At the same time, there has never been a period in American history when the immediate prospects, at least, were so dark and overwhelmingly depressing. We have utopia within our reach, but unless we take rapid and drastic steps to modernize and improve our institutions, especially education, we shall actually pluck chaos from the tree of life.

Professor Leander Boykin is chairman of the department of Sociology at Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

HAS THORNDIKE LIVED IN VAIN?

Stephen G. Rich

From educators, psychologists and sociologists, up and down the world, all those who deal with the workings of the human mind pay lip-service to the doctrines of Edward Lee Thorndike. His is a name to conjure with, whenever the processes of learning are discussed. The proponents of "progressive education" and the traditionalist who would emphasize training mechanical skills, alike call upon Thorndike's doctrines to back their preferences.

In view of this fact, the title of this paper is a challenge. Yet its purpose is serious; to show that while the name of

Thorndike is revered and the man himself is loved, his doctrines are very fully neglected—neglected by those who might be most expected to utilize them fully.

During some forty years of contributions to our knowledge of the human mind as it acts in learning-situations, Thorndike has covered many different aspects thereof. At almost every point he and his associated workers have contributed new and sure information. Aided by facilities for conducting studies requiring work by many persons, he has multiplied his own thought and influence. Out of this multiplicity of contributions to our knowledge, I here select the three which in my personal judgment are most significant.

The first contribution was made as early as 1904, with the publication of the first edition of *Mental and Social Measurements*. This book in its second edition, 1913, utilizing developments which had been catalyzed into existence by the first edition and aided by the growth of biometrics, definitely established the methods and procedures of mental measurement. From this time on, mental measurement has been a technique, consistent within itself, capable of being learned and applied by any reasonably competent person. Let Thorndike's own words, from the preface to the first edition, state what the contribution essentially consists in:

Experience has sufficiently shown that the facts of human nature can be made the material for quantitative science. The direct transfer of methods originating in the physical sciences or in commercial arithmetic to sciences dealing with the complex and variable facts of human life has, however, resulted in crude and often fallacious measurements. Moreover, it has been difficult to teach students to estimate quantitative evidence properly or to obtain and use it wisely.

It is the aim of this book to introduce students to the theory of mental measurements and to provide them with such knowledge and practice as may assist them to follow critically quantitative evidence and argument and to make their own researches exact and logical.

Thorndike's fundamental contributions lies in the use of the methods of handling what he aptly calls "variable

facts." The same methods have found use in biometrics. Indeed, Chapter III of the second edition bears the name: "The Measurement of a Variable Fact." The real core of his contribution, whether original with him, or original only in assemblage of various methods and criteria from various sources into a coherent, workable system of technology, is in Chapter I of this second edition: "Units and Scales." The section on "The Essentials of a Valid Scale" perhaps carries more of the needed coordination of different portions of the system of thought than any other.

This insistence on the valid scale constitutes the real heart of the work of Thorndike on mental measurements. In his terse statement of what constitutes a valid scale, he hides a contribution which would be sufficient glory for any person to have made, if he had done nothing further. The valid scale, according to Thorndike, needs to be: objective, consistent, definite in its differences, comparable with the objects measured, and established with reference to a valid and known zero-point.

One aspect needs further mention. A necessary characteristic of a valid scale, according to Thorndike, is that computations made in terms of measurements using such a scale shall give correct, valid results. Thus, to use an example often cited by Thorndike's pupil, the late Professor Margaret E. Noonan of New York University: — if one treats percentages as a valid scale in mental measurements, the results are fallacious. If we take a building twenty feet high and add one ten-foot story, we increase its height fifty per cent. But a similar ten-foot story added to the Empire State Building increases the height just 1.25%. If we say that a man's attainment in broad jumping exceeds that of 97% of all jumpers, or that "he is at the 97 percentile" and then compare him with another whose jump exceeds 99.5% of all and is at the 99.5 percentile, we use an invalid scale in this same way. Surely it is most unlikely that this difference of $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ in percentile rank represents

a difference of $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ in distance jumped, or is achieved with $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ more ability or effort.

Here Thorndike's contribution is the establishment of means by which we may convert such crude percents or percentiles, as well as other forms of crude measurements, into actual measurements which are:

1. Comparable with each other; and
2. Usable for reliable, valid computations.

The question of whether Thorndike's methods here are original with him or derived from such workers as Galton, Spearman, etc., is not in point. Thorndike brought the various procedures together into a coherent and workable technique. What he did was also to establish that the facts of mental life can be handled by such methods. Today this is "obvious" to us. Thirty-five to forty years ago nobody knew whether or not it was true. Thorndike provided the factual basis for our present sure understanding that such is the case.

Genius as well as courage was required to set up such an hypothesis. Hard work was required to establish it factually. By actually studying the same mental fact in a hundred or a thousand or more people, and handling the results thus statistically, Thorndike in the period around 1905 to 1910 demonstrated that this was actual measurement of a mental "variable fact." Here is a major contribution.

The means of accurate measurement which Thorndike thus developed, aided materially in the making of his two other most significant contributions. The reader need only be cautioned that the term "accurate" should not be read as "precise to a large number of figures" (as in the measurements of physics and chemistry) but with due regard to the inherent limits of the measuring instruments here used.

Thorndike's second contribution, among his most significant ones, appeared in numerous papers in psychological and educational journals between 1905 and 1914. It is fairly

well summed up in his *Educational Psychology*, published in 1914. This is the demonstration beyond all question of the specificity of training and learning. So far as factual discovery and report can ever kill any doctrine, Thorndike dealt a death blow to the old ideas of "transfer of training," "spread of training," and "general mental training."

Let us be precise on what was discovered.

Thorndike and his colleagues showed finally and conclusively that one cannot learn one thing by learning another. A simple case is that of learning to spell. One cannot learn to write words correctly by learning to say aloud the order of letters in those words. In a more complex case, one does not learn to handle the English language by studying some other, whether it be Anglo-Saxon, Latin or Zulu. If any alleged "general training in language," such as is still blithely and uncritically mentioned by many, takes place—we lack evidence that such is the case. Certainly nobody has yet presented evidence of carry-over from learning Latin into learning Japanese, for example. In matters aesthetic, the absence of transfer is conspicuous. The musician certainly does not gain ability to respond to the sculpture of Rodin from his ability to respond to the beauties of Chopin's music; nor does he get from his educated response to the massed stimuli of Wagner any power to understand or feel the merits of such an architectural masterpiece as Louis Sullivan's great Chicago Auditorium interior.

Thorndike never denied, or attempted to deny, that where there is a conscious "common element" as between two fields or divisions of subject-matter learned, carry-over from one to the other may occur. He has determined and measured the incidence of carry-over of this sort. His contribution may be summed up in words other than his own:

The carry-over from one field of learning, whether in memory, in judgment, or in emotional effect, to any other, is so small and so

erratic in its incidence, that to count upon it in the slightest as a fact of human nature, is to state an almost entire untruth.

In some speech, the locus of which I have not found, he is reported to have said "It is folly to spend an hour a day for four years to teach a pupil Latin, in the hope of helping his English, when there will be no effect in four cases out of five, and at best as much as in one year of such time devoted directly to English as a subject of instruction."

Let us avoid certain confusions still current on this matter.

Nothing which has been said by Thorndike or this author affects or underestimates the existence of content shared by two or more fields. As Thorndike himself has put it, we do not have a "transfer of training" when one runs across a familiar idea, a known fact, or a previously understood relationship, between matters thought on in a new field. Thus we have no "transfer" when a student recognizes and uses his knowledge of vocabulary and word-order from German in learning High Dutch, Anglo-Saxon or Afrikaans. In fact, no man has done more than Thorndike himself to show us, by example after example, the extent to which such community of actual content in the material learned, has been mistaken for transfer of training.

A linguistic pitfall exists here, when the same word is used in different fields with different meanings. Neglect of this semantic fact is, as Thorndike himself has many times mentioned, a prime cause of the persistence of the belief in "formal discipline" or "general training of the faculties."

Thorndike's third major, significant contribution to our knowledge of the human mind was made public in 1928, in his compact book, *Adult Learning*. The very terseness and rigidly logical, cogent treatment in this volume has perhaps been a contributory factor in making it too little appreciated. For Thorndike was no journalist; and if he had any flair for publicity and its methods, he carefully

kept anything "sensational" in presentation out of this book.

His contribution here is not too easily phrased. Possibly the following statement of it, as I word the matter, may avoid any misunderstandings:

Part first of this contribution of Thorndike is the discovery that learning ability of every sort continues to grow, for at least nine out of every ten persons, up to a maximum of speed and effectiveness, that is reached at about the age of twenty-eight years with most persons, and which is retained without substantial change for some years.

Part second is the discovery that, for these same nine out of every ten persons learning ability decreases exceedingly slow after the early thirties. Thorndike found that the rate of diminution is about one per cent a year from around age thirty-three up to age sixty-five, to which he carried his studies. Beyond age sixty-five, he makes no statement — apparently with the plan tacitly understood of making a later separate study of mental changes in older persons.

Part third is the discovery that at the age of fifty we are most of us still superior in learning ability to our own selves when, at the age of seventeen or eighteen we were ready to enter college.

Learning ability as studied in these three parts of the Adult Learning investigation is not limited in scope. It is not merely rote learning, not only the ability to memorize, not merely logical learning alone, nor yet mere motor control such as is involved in learning to typewrite. A comprehensive group of abilities, covering aesthetic reactions and other judgments, entered into the total of information which has just been summarized.

Opinion in the scholarly world, outside of those persons specifically acquainted with psychology in detail, would probably be that the author is unjust to Thorndike, neglecting his most widely influential contribution, in naming measurement, non-transfer and persistence of adult learning power, as his major, lasting contributions. Scholarly opinion most likely would fasten upon intelligence tests and

their progeny, as Thorndike's most significant contributions. Such a judgment must be denied validity.

Thorndike neither invented nor made generally popular the intelligence test. Thorndike neither invented nor made popular and made useful the achievement test. Nor can Thorndike be blamed (or credited) for the illegitimate off-spring of the mental achievement tests — those "new style examinations" which have become such a regular feature of current educational practice. He did not invent or popularize the "true-false" question, the "best answer" question with four or five responses set down from which to choose. He did not invent, popularize, or even advocate the "completion test." These need to be named correctly as "illegitimate off-spring" of mental and achievement tests, since they appear to be identical with such tests, and yet lack everything that makes any standardized test a valid measuring instrument.

The sole merit of these illegitimate offspring, attributed wrongly to Thorndike, lies in the fact that they measure information without introducing an unknown quantity of various language abilities. The true nature of such "new type examinations" was shown up in a number of papers in *School Science & Mathematics* around 1925. Indeed, in one such article, it was shown that a New York state Regents' examination in chemistry, in the "new type," hit an all-time high of banality with 97 out of 102 items on it requiring verbal memory and nothing more.

The prevalence of these "new type examinations" may perhaps justly become the most obvious sign that Thorndike has worked and lived in vain.

Had the examination-makers had even faint lucubrations of the ideas of Thorndike, they would have known that a subjectively devised series of "new type" questions is no more valid for measuring an achievement or a group of mental powers, than an old style or "essay" test of similar subjective origin. This holds true whether one man or

a committee devises the questions. Unless a genuine scale of results is also devised — by actual objective and experimental means — scores on old and new type tests alike are without quantitative meaning.

To conform to Thorndike's discovery of how to do mental measurement, such test material would have to be subjected to trial and sifting. Each question would have to be tried out on a reasonably large random sampling of the personnel expected to use it. Each question must become an instrument whose usefulness is known. Certain questions show up as unworkable under such objective trial, and have to be discarded. On those not discarded, the proportions of success in answering correctly each question need to be discovered. Thorndike himself has pointed out the need to have in any valid mental or achievement test, some questions so easy that almost everyone gets them right, and some so difficult that almost nobody gets them right. A workable measuring instrument must be a scale that reaches down far enough and up far enough to measure every person to whom the test is to be given.

Besides this, discovery by actual trial, of the total scores which may be expected on the test, is essential. Until we have such results, usually called "norms," we do not have a measuring device at all.

Thorndike's own measuring scales, as for the abilities used in office work, would be valueless without just this information. Thorndike himself has sufficiently emphasized the need for such "norms" not only for this purpose, but for establishing the actual measuring scale of equal units.

Thus, the very persons who in many cases believe they are following Thorndike's work in mental measurement are neglecting his discoveries almost completely.

But the most extensive and harmful neglect of Thorndike's work is in another aspect.

It is now approximately three and a half decades since

Thorndike published his *Educational Psychology*. In that book, he disposed of the traditional belief in "general mental training" or "spread of training." Yet within a dozen years after this book had appeared, traces of the old doctrine were starting to seep back into educational and sociological thinking. Indeed, it would appear as if sociology in that period had never even discovered that Thorndike had disposed of the old doctrine at all.

Even allowing for the normal period of cultural lag, the period since 1940 should have seen a complete adjustment to the absence of transfer of training. But an examination of current and recent writings, from textbooks to popularizing articles, from treatises to learned-journal monographs, shows that outright "transfer of training" statements keep on being made and being used as logical steps in developing theories and practice.

For instance, in 1937 this author presented a paper "What Philately Does Not Teach" (3rd American Philatelic Congress Book, 1937, Chicago), dealing with the widely held ideas among hobbyists that the various hobbies and especially stamp-collecting can be justified by the claim that they teach such general supposed mental virtues as "neatness," "observation" and so on. In the discussion at the actual meeting, despite the presentation of Thorndike's results, almost all the persons present attacked the elimination of "transfer of training" and believed that under the stimulus of a hobby interest it might take place. I was called fancy names for asking for evidence that any such transfer took place.

Who among us can aver that he has ever known even the most learned and wide-awake preacher to discard the idea of "general training" or spread of training, in his discussions of ethical and moral practice? In fact, it might be invidious, though quite useful, to point out the extent to which this doctrine is taken for granted in every article on religious education that has appeared in this journal in the

last four years. Specific references are omitted because of their plethora, not because of any difficulty of finding them. A few among us may recall the "Classical Investigation" of the later 1920's financed by a group of agencies whose primary interest was to show that the study of Greek and Latin had special educational values that should be conserved. This report included, curiously enough, an investigation by Thorndike and his co-workers on transfer or spread of training. This section merely strengthened Thorndike's earlier results with more evidence of the same sort as previously brought to public notice. The net result was to re-state these results in terms of the more accurate measurements available thus later.

But in other parts of the report, Thorndike's ideas were slapped out of court mercilessly! There was a section of quotations from the opinions of men in all walks of life, eminent men, as to the supposed values of the classical education they had received. See what they said: man after man spoke glibly and assuredly of the "general mental training" he received from the study of Greek, Latin or both of these primitive, difficult languages. Man after man remained held by the unproven — and false — theory of mental faculties inherited from the days before we had any actual objective knowledge of the human mind.

As a sample of the neglect of Thorndike's work on the absence of transfer of training, I cite a typical college textbook in psychology for educational use. I cite *Psychology And The New Education* by Sidney L. Pressey (1933 Copyright), widely used and quite typical of texts in use in 1949.

Pressey, who is competent and well informed, who wrote in a period when the cultural lag on Thorndike's work should have long passed, still straddled the question. In a forty page chapter on "Transfer of Training" he presents the problem ably and gives a fine statement of the means to attack it. Also the criteria for judging the results of ex-

perimental work in the field are given. Then he cites a melange of experimental reports that are largely irrelevant, instead of citing the knock-down, knock-out work that Thorndike had done and with which he had settled the question over twenty years earlier. Pressey, however, clearly shows that he personally goes with Thorndike. Says he (page 525): "Subjects can legitimately be kept in the curriculum only for their intrinsic, not for their disciplinary or indirect value." Such is his inconsistency!

Most sociological work, along with that of the psychiatrists, seems to ignore the discovery of Thorndike that transfer or spread of training simply doesn't exist. Again it would be invidious to cite cases; but the reader is specially referred to the March 1949 number of this JOURNAL for a rich harvest of both implicit and explicit statements that require the existence of transfer of training to make any sense. Mention must be made also that almost every work, and indeed every article, "heavy" or popularizing, on "character education," leans heavily on this doctrine that Thorndike disproved a generation ago.

Little as we may like it, candor must make us admit that our late and unlamented enemies, the Fascists (both Italian and German), were far more informed than we yet are, on the specificity of mental functions and acts. They did not leave the spread of their poisonous ideas to chance or to any supposed spread of training. They indoctrinated child and adult alike with every aspect of every idea which they wished to have believed. For instance, every aspect of their "Herrenvolk" delusion was systematically publicized again and again.

We pass to another of Thorndike's major contributions: that of bringing mental facts into measurable and measured units.

Even among educated people there still persists the idea that Army mental tests of the First World War showed

that "the average American was at the mental level of a twelve year old child." That judgment was widely circulated. But it is based on going directly against all that we know of mental measurement—all that Thorndike has taught us as to accurate methods in that field.

The Army mental tests were set up on the basis of a "mental age" which was derived from the abilities on the activities included and their totals, typically found in normal persons chronologically of each age. But this is an "uneven scale," as has been repeatedly shown. It is an irregular scale, with the intervals between mental ages far smaller from eleven up than lower on the scale. Thorndike, himself, had a good share in discovering this fact.

This confusion is further confounded by the fact that the Army Mental tests are, strictly speaking, not set up into a real scale at all. These mental ages are derived from point scores: summations of total numbers of points secured by performance of each person on the tests used. The points or units of this measurement cannot be defended as being equal, or even approximately equal. Some points may indicate four times as large a difference or addition as others, if we are to trust the National Academy of Science's thousand-page monograph on Army Mental Testing (1922).

In interpretation of mental test results, Thorndike has been gloriously forgotten. His good sense told him that all these claims as to "measuring innate ability" are not even statistically valid, let alone logically valid. The smaller people, however, failed to realize this and made claims of the most absurd sort.

The third of Thorndike's major discoveries was largely neglected from its publication in 1928 until 1942. War conditions necessitated attention to it, but also drew into strong relief neglect of it in other quarters.

In *Adult Learning* (1928) Thorndike demonstrated that learning ability is at its maximum in the ages around

twenty-eight to thirty-one years. He also showed that this total of abilities normally declines at about one per cent per year from this peak. A curious sidelight which comes out in his treatment, is that while actual learning ability has begun to become less by age thirty-seven, the top of actual performance in things learned is reached at about that age. The results published would indicate that a man of forty-five is actually just as able to learn difficult, complicated motor skills as a youth of twenty. The need for man-power in industry led to the employment of middle aged men and women by many industrial firms. Cautiously, the employers took them on — and learned “the hard way” what Thorndike had told us fourteen years earlier. It is doubtful if one in a hundred of the personnel men who worked in this development even knew that Thorndike had discovered and published these facts.

But the neglect of Thorndike's discoveries continued in the armed forces. Subjective opinion of “brass” ruled there, so that men of twenty-eight or twenty-nine were regularly rejected as “too old” to be trained as air pilots, as bombardiers, or in some cases even for handling tanks or artillery. I have seen in print, during the war, statements by responsible military officers that men of even twenty-five or twenty-six do not learn the war skills as quickly as youngsters.

The “cultural lag” here shown, on all three major portions of Thorndike's work has in my judgment caused definite harm, definite loss of human welfare.

The greatest loss of all has come from the persistence of the erroneous belief in spread or transfer of training. Because of this belief, high school students are subjected to linguistic or mathematical instruction, which is without effect upon them other than to create an antipathy to some one language, to all languages, or to mathematical doings of any sort. Colleges, steeped in the misinformed doctrine

are largely to blame. They force their absurd requirements of "so many years of Latin," "so much mathematics," for entrance, on the basis of "training the mental faculties." . . . or relegate students to a sub-standard degree and perhaps ineligibility for honor societies, if these requirements are not met.

Instead of facing the actual situation and, in the manner of Thorndike, asking what particular contribution is made by each subject as it is actually taught, educational practitioners go the old way. They fail to dismiss from all practical consideration the unpredictable, small and usually unimportant amount of "spread of training" that occurs.

The "Progressive Educators" are tarred with this brush perhaps more than the traditional ones. It would be hard indeed to find any group of educators who really rely more upon an assumed and unknown amount of transfer of training. Their unwillingness to give specific drill on the basal mechanical skills and knowledges is a striking confirmation of this situation.

Thorndike, himself, after his retirement from active professional work in 1942, admitted by his own words that his work had been in vain. In the fall of 1943 appeared his book *Man And His Works*, the William James Lectures at Harvard. Thus far, up to 1949, this volume has failed to get adequate notice and discussion in educational, psychological, and sociological journals.

For, with this book, Thorndike abandoned psychology and became a sociologist. Much could be quoted, space permitting, to emphasize the far reaching nature of his thinking, the good horse-sense and the excellent wording of his hypotheses. But the real point is that this last book of his only underlined the thesis: Thorndike has lived and worked in vain. So he changed into another field for his "last words."

The same methods which Bobbitt and others applied in determination of educational purposes, sociologically, twenty odd years ago are here conspicuously used. Two

chapters, "The Welfare of Individuals" and "The Welfare of Communities" are neither more nor less than the best sort of strictly sociological analysis. The chapter "The Psychology of Punishment" may contain traces of psychology — but any sociologist who would not claim this chapter as strictly in his field would no doubt find himself a literal traitor to his chosen field.

Of ten chapters, only two in this book are psychological at all. The one on "Learning" is a superb and compact statement of the "S-R Bond" psychology, which has been the basis of Thorndike's systematic thinking. No statement of it, by Thorndike himself or anyone else, thus far made public, approaches this in cogent clarity. The one on "The Origin Of Language" is a stimulating piece of speculative thinking or theorizing in psychology — constructing a "meta-psychology." This fine job of good clear thinking with a new theory, that of "Babel-Luck" ably propounded, deserves attention it has not yet received. Whether the ideas can be verified, or whether they will fall under attack, does not matter. Yet even in this chapter, the abandonment of psychology as such, for the methods of sociology cannot escape our notice.

To sum up:

We all give lip service to the name of Thorndike.

We, most of us, believe we are following his results. But most of us depart from them consistently in our actual practice.

Thus: Thorndike's work, real contributions to psychology, has been robbed of the great and enduring effects it ought to have produced.

Such is the tragedy of one of America's greatest, soundest, and most prolific minds: the beloved leader, Edward Lee Thorndike.

Dr. Stephen G. Rich is a member of the editorial board of the JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY and a trustee of the Payne Educational Sociology Foundation.

RACIAL ATTITUDE SURVEY AS A BASIS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING: THE BROADVIEW (SEATTLE) STUDY

**Stuart C. Dodd
Robert W. O'Brien**

Relationship of Research to Planning

Attitude surveys may be conducted to develop instruments of measurement to get at "the facts" in intergroup relations. Community planning is often a device used to effect "socially desirable" change. The Broadview Study is an attempt to utilize precise instruments of measurement to direct community planning.

The Incident Pointing up Broadview

In September, 1948, a racial issue flared up in the Broadview community when a mixed white-Negro family established residence. There had been charges that anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic feelings also existed in the area. Tensions became focused, however, when petitions were circulated requesting that the family be forced to move. On the other hand some residents held that there should be no racial or religious restrictions in the district.

Broadview is a middle-class neighborhood, which, like other sections of the Metropolitan District, has grown rapidly during and since World War II. Local civic leaders say that about one-half of the families living there have moved in within the past five years, and they estimate the average income of families is now between \$4,000 and \$4,500 per year.

This had been an all-white section until 1946 when a Filipino and a Chinese family moved in. But their children took such a psychological beating that the parents felt it necessary to move.

On July 20, 1948, the present family purchased a home in the district and moved in. The husband, a Caucasian, was a postal clerk with twelve years of postal service experience: eleven years in Los Angeles, and one in Seattle. During the first month, his wife, a Negro, was aware that some of the neighbors stared at her; but none was either overtly hostile or friendly. By the end of the fourth week, August 15, several threatening, anonymous telephone calls had been received urging that the family move; they were not wanted.

A week later a friendly neighbor visited to say that she refused to sign a petition to force the family to move, and that she thought there were many who felt as she did. By early September several attempts had been made by residents and real estate men to buy out the family; one party offered a \$3,000 profit which was refused.

The son entered school for the first time and met considerable hostility from children who called him derisive names. But with the help of teachers, acceptance began before the first week had passed.

A Move to Promote Good Feeling

In view of the threatening telephone calls, the family contacted the Urban League for assistance in working out better relationships. A League staff member visited various neighborhood leaders in an effort to establish cordial relationships for the family. Finally these leaders formed a committee consisting of educators, a business man, a housewife, and various clergymen to ascertain what constructive steps might be taken to work out the adjustment of the new family to the community and the community to the family. Pastors of several churches visited them and also spoke to members of their congregations and parishes regarding community responsibility for demonstrating democratic attitudes. Some of the neighbors began to drop in to visit the family socially, to play pinochle, and to invite

them to their homes. The mother was encouraged to attend the meeting of the Broadview P.T.A. and from all accounts it appears she was cordially received.

A Survey of Interracial Attitudes Is Requested

As the committee discussed the problem further, it was decided that more facts were needed on the opinions and attitudes of householders in order to ascertain the extent and degree of tensions. The committee considered this a pre-requisite to intelligent community planning. Accordingly, the Urban League was asked to request the University of Washington to make a survey.

Professors Dodd and O'Brien met with the committee on October 27 to discuss the desirability and scope of the survey. Between the 28th and the 30th, the preliminary questions were formulated with the help of students and the University Public Opinion Laboratory. On November 1, Professors Dodd and O'Brien and staff met in the Broadview School with the committee to evaluate the questions and to agree on a possible questionnaire.

One significant factor of the study was a dimensional plan of a poll, which was drawn up by Dr. Dodd. It was a job analysis of the fifty processes. Included were the dates of each process, the number of man hours, the location of each, and the persons responsible, with their motives (pay, academic credit, civic service) and the documents needed or resulting. This analysis revealed in advance exactly what was to be done, where, by, with, and for whom it was to be done, why it was to be done, and with what materials. The use of such a plan compels completeness in advance, in an analysis of a social organization.

As originally planned, all 400 houses in the area were selected to be surveyed rather than a sample of these. They were divided into units and were assigned to a staff of forty interviewers.

Three hundred and four residents were interviewed,

thirty-five others refused to give information, and no contact was made at sixty-seven places. In the latter case, either no one was at home, or the houses were unoccupied, or the residents were too busy to be interviewed during the two days of the survey.

Background Factors Are Explored

Approximately eighty per cent of the residents interviewed were high school graduates, and more than thirty-two per cent had attended college or university.

The area is a white gentile neighborhood with only the one non-white couple. No Jews were indicated by the replies on religious preference. Twenty-one per cent of the respondents preferred the Roman Catholic faith and sixty-five per cent were Protestants. The remainder indicated either "none" or some "other" preference. Church attendance seemed to be higher than for Seattle generally. One person in four attended every Sunday and one in two attended regularly or occasionally.

A substantial number of the residents had recently moved into the area. Nineteen per cent had lived there less than a year and sixty per cent had moved there less than five years before. Only one family in five lived in the neighborhood at the beginning of World War II.

This factor of mobility is borne out by the geographic backgrounds of respondents in terms of the places where they attended grade school. Only twenty per cent attended grade schools in the Seattle area and forty-two per cent in the State of Washington. Twenty-nine per cent received their grade school education in the Mid-West; eleven per cent in other western and Pacific Coast states; seven per cent in Europe; three per cent respectively in Canada, the Mid-Atlantic states, and the South; and one per cent in Alaska. It is more likely that the amount of mobility is under-estimated rather than over-estimated, since three in-

interviews in five of the study were with women, instead of with the more traditionally mobile males.

The Controversial Question of Property Values Is Appraised

The contention of realtors in the area that property values had decreased because Negroes were now living in the neighborhood was not supported by the study. To the question: "Do you feel that property values in your block have increased or decreased recently?" only about ten per cent of the residents said "decreased." Fifty per cent said "increased." Twenty-seven per cent did not know. Nine per cent said there had been no change and four per cent gave no answer.

Many respondents were not even aware that a Negro family was living in the area. To the question: "Are there any Negro families living in your neighborhood?" (within one-half dozen blocks or so) 193 or about sixty-three per cent of the respondents answered "No" or "don't know"; 109 or thirty-six per cent said "Yes"; and two or less than one per cent gave no answer. Only two per cent were acquainted with the family.

All respondents were asked whether they "approved" or "disapproved" of a Negro family living in the area. More than fourteen per cent said "approve" and another sixteen per cent said "don't care." Nearly sixty-three per cent said disapprove."

Mathematical analyses will be made of the correlations of the responses to the various questions. Only one has been completed to date. It relates the "approval" or "disapproval" of respondents that the Negro family or a Negro family should live in the district, to whether or not respondents knew that a Negro family was already living there.

We can assume that the attitudes of those who did not know of the family at the time of the survey were representative of the attitudes of all respondents prior to the moving in of the family. Any difference in the attitude of

those who knew of the family from that of those who did not know of the family, is then due to changes caused by knowledge of the family's presence in the district.

Quite contrary to common expectation, a larger per cent of those respondents who knew that the family was living in the district were favorable to a Negro family being there than of those who did not know. The presence of the Negro family in the district has resulted in nine more persons becoming favorable, and nine less persons being unfavorable, than would have been expected on the basis of the percentages among those who did not know of the family.

Not all who expressed disapproval of Negroes as neighbors felt that property values would decrease because of them. It has been stated that sixty-three per cent of the respondents expressed disapproval. Those who disapproved and who also thought property values would depreciate constituted only about twenty-nine per cent of all the respondents. This added to the seven per cent, who while approving of the Negro family — though believing property values would depreciate, makes a total of *thirty-six per cent which represents all of the respondents who believed that property values decrease because of the residence of a Negro in the area.*

A comparison of opinions on property devaluation before and after the respondents had gained insight that the survey was concerned with the residence of a Negro family in the neighborhood, reveals an interesting phenomenon. Before any questions on race relations were asked, only ten per cent of the respondents thought that their property had decreased in value recently. But after such questions had been posed, thirty-six per cent were of the opinion that the presence of a Negro family had or would cause property devaluation. Since the family had lived in the neighborhood for more than three months at the time of the survey, it is clear that not the presence of the family, but the fears of respondents were responsible for this opinion.

Among the ten per cent of respondents who originally said that their property values had declined recently were those who gave as a reason the presence of a Negro family. However, these amounted to only two per cent of all respondents. The fifty per cent of the respondents, who originally said that their property had increased recently, gave more acceptable reasons in terms of: increase in value of all property, new building activity in the area, and the prospect of more street improvements.

Petitions Pro and Con Are Investigated

Of significance also is an expression of democratic intent as revealed by those who would sign a petition "to protect the right" of a Negro family to live in the neighborhood. This response was given by nineteen per cent of the respondents, including some of both those who approved of a resident Negro family and those who, although disapproving, would not sign a petition, "to get this Negro family out of the neighborhood."

A similar expression of democratic intent is perhaps implied in the responses to the questions: "Would you sign a petition to get this family out of your neighborhood?" asked of those who knew of the family; and, "Would you sign a petition to keep Negroes from living in this neighborhood?" asked of those who did not know of the family. About thirty per cent of the respondents said "No." Forty-nine per cent said "Yes," with the bulk of this response (thirty-six per cent) coming from those who were unaware of the family's presence in the area. Thus again there is a substantial difference between those who disapprove and those who would activate their disapproval by protest in signing a petition.

Respondents who said they would sign such a petition were asked if they had signed one. Those who said they had signed the petition that had been circulated to get the family out amounted to only eight per cent of all respond-

ents and not the ninety per cent alleged by the realtors.

Tolerant Attitudes Are Shown

Despite the fact that sixty-three per cent of the respondents did not favor Negroes living in the neighborhood, more than eighty-eight per cent said that they would not go out of their way to make people of different racial groups feel unwanted. On the other hand, nearly sixty-eight per cent would not go out of their way to make them feel wanted. This may have an important bearing on tolerance. Not only does it indicate the relative lack of attempts at intimidation, but there is an indication that more people would favor making people of other racial groups wanted than would favor making them unwanted. Only five per cent of the respondents, approximately, said "Yes" they would go out of their way "to make them feel unwanted." But seventeen per cent said they would go out of their way "to make them feel wanted."

A majority of the respondents in the Broadview study showed only limited or no experience with minority group persons in the normally accepted categories of community living. About seventy-nine per cent had not attended school where there were a "considerable" number of Negroes, Japanese, or Chinese. The highest number, forty-five per cent, occurred where persons had worked on jobs with them — primarily Negroes. A similar number, approximately twenty-nine per cent, had had persons of all three groups as "close friends" and as "neighbors." Again these were more largely Negroes than others, but not significantly so.

The apparent lack of experience in school may be taken as an indication of the absence of association with minority group persons during childhood. Hence the limited experience with minorities which was indicated in the replies to the other questions can be assumed to have occurred largely during adulthood.

Six social distance questions were included in the study primarily as a pre-testing for a statewide survey of inter-group relations which the University of Washington will conduct. These questions, however, are pertinent to this study and constitute an attempt to measure the attitudes of respondents (all Caucasian gentile) toward Catholics, Chinese, Japanese, Jews, Negroes and Protestants.

Each respondent was handed a card on which were printed the group names listed above. Each was then asked: "Are there any on the list

- 1) you would not want to have as close friends?"
- 2) you would not be willing to marry?"
- 3) whose teen-agers you would not want to see attend parties with teen-agers boys and girls of your own group?"
- 4) whose teen-agers you would not want to have in the same schools as teen-agers of your own group?"
- 5) that you would avoid sitting by?"
- 6) you would not want to work beside as equals on the job?"

Respondents consistently expressed greater social distance for Negroes than for any other groups. The order of increasing acceptance was Negro, Japanese, Chinese, Jew, Catholic, and Protestant. Social distance for these groups decreased from marriage, to close friends, to teen-age parties, to teen-age and schools, to work, to sitting beside; and in reverse order the percentage of respondents who showed no distance to groups increased from three per cent at the question of marriage, to seventy-six per cent and seventy-seven per cent respectively for the questions on teen-agers and schools, and sitting by members of the groups. The rising curve was broken at the question about working beside members of groups as equals. Here it dipped to fifty-six per cent of the respondents who showed no social distance.

Summary and Conclusion

There are good opportunities in Broadview for developing better attitudes toward colored minorities. The following points are an indication of this:

1. It should be noted that a much smaller percentage of petition signers (eight per cent) was found by the study than the ninety per cent alleged by local realtors; and that nineteen per cent of the respondents would be willing to sign petitions to protect the right of a Negro family to live in the area.

2. Thirty-six per cent of the respondents *are willing* to have Negroes in Broadview.

3. Seventeen per cent would go out of their way to make a family of a different racial group feel wanted.

4. Property devaluation was the main reason given by realtors for not wanting Negroes in the neighborhood. But fifty per cent of the respondents after a mixed racial family had lived there for three months felt that property values had increased recently. Only ten per cent said "decreased" among which only two per cent gave a racial reason, and only 3.6 per cent thought that a resident Negro family would cause a decrease in values.

5. There are strong suggestions of tolerance which can grow into understanding. The feeling that people should not go out of their way to make a resident of another race feel unwanted, is one.

The study findings imply the presence in the neighborhood of a potentially articulate minority who feel quite strongly about keeping Broadview an all-white and perhaps an all-gentile area. It seems likely that this group is represented among the five per cent who would go out of their way to make a family of a different race feel unwanted, and among the eight per cent who had signed a petition to get the family out.

This intolerant minority, however, is balanced by a minority who feel strongly that democracy can be practiced in daily life. The latter group is represented among the thirty-six per cent who are willing to have Negroes in Broadview; among the seventeen per cent who would go out of their way to make a family of a different racial group feel wanted; and by the Broadview Committee which being organized can be a strong force for influencing the people who feel less strongly about democratic principles to implement the democracy they would all say they believed in.

Dr. Stuart C. Dodd and Dr. Robert W. O'Brien are Professors in the Department of Sociology, University of Washington at Seattle.